

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

NM

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/324,443 10/17/94 DOYLE

M 02307553

020350 B3M1/0825
TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO CA 94111

EXAMINER

ART UNIT, D PAPER NUMBER

45

2317

DATE MAILED: 08/25/97

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on 6-2-97 This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), 0 days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6. _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

Claims 1 - 56 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. Claims 6 - 43, 49 - 56 have been cancelled.

3. Claims _____ are allowed.

4. Claims 1 - 5, 44 - 48 are rejected.

5. Claims _____ are objected to.

6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.65 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).

10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation).

12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.

13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's arguments filed 06-02-97 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1,2,5, and 44,45,48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant disclosed prior art and further in view Koppolu et al. US patent 5,581,686.

As per claim 1, Applicant disclosed prior art [pages 1-10: Mosaic + HTTP + HTML + "World Wide Web"] has the limitations essentially as claimed client workstation, network server coupled in a distributed hypermedia environment [p.8 lines 15-30]; executing on the client a browser application [p.4 Mosaic] that parses distributed hypermedia document to identify text formats [HTML tags] and for responding to predetermined text formats to initiate processes specified by the text format [p.4-5];

utilizing the browser to display, on said client workstation, portion of a first hypermedia document received over the network, wherein the hypermedia document includes an embed text format specifies the location of an object external to the hypermedia document [p.4 lines 4-12, p.5 lines 9-26].

It is apparent that specifies type of information [p.5 lines 11 - text, images, sound, video...] is utilized by the browser to identify and locate an executable application external to the hypermedia document [p.4 lines 13-22 - "viewer" software];

The prior art does not have embed text format specifying an external object which automatically invoke an external application to execute and enable interactive processing within a portion of the browser controlled window. The prior art provide display and interaction with an external object by launching an associated program in a separate window.

Koppolu teaches a method for in-place interaction with a contained object. Koppolu method permit automatic display and interaction of a linked object in a compound document [i.e. hypermedia document] within a portion of a window controlled by a container application [i.e. the browser] (see fig.1, col.8 line 50-68, col.9 lines 10-28, claims 1-2). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use the teaching of Koppolu to the processing of the hypermedia document of the disclosed prior art because it would have provided a more

integrated and expandable system for processing/viewing of linked objects in the hypermedia documents and reduces clustering of window display.

HTML is a text tag structure document encoding. It is apparent the prior art as modified would have had a text tag for indicating links to an in-place interactive object.

As per claim 2, Koppolu teaches the interactively controlling via inter-process communication between the browser [container application] and said controllable application [server application] (see col.8 lines 1-7).

As per claim 5, Koppolu teaches the applications continue to communicate after the controllable application has been launched (col.13 lines 65 to col.14 line 5).

As per claim 44, it is rejected under similar rationale as for claim 1 above.

As per claim 45, it is rejected under similar rationale as for claim 2 above.

As per claim 48, it is rejected under similar rationale as for claim 5 above.

Claims 3-4 and 46-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant disclosed prior art and Koppolu et al. US patent 5,581,686, and further in views of Moran

"Tele-Nicer-Dicer: A new tool for the visualization of large volumetric data".

As per claim 3, the disclosed prior art does not disclose interactively controlling via commands sent over the distributed environment. Moran discloses a distributed application (TNSD) for interactive control and visualization of graphical object through communication over network. Moran application allow usage of remote system resources for visualization of large data set at a client station. Moran discloses sending command to remote server, executing on the server, and sending result to the client to process and display [p.3 col.2-3 specifically col.1 3rd paragraph]. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize Moran application as an external application ("Viewer") in the prior art system as modified because it would have improved the system by enabling the client station access to resources on higher performance servers and to have interactive visualization of large data set capability.

As per claim 4, it is apparent that the system as modified would have instructions residing on the client workstation in order to provide the resulting graphic representation [NSD visualization tool - p.1 col.2 last paragraph].

As per claims 46-47, they are rejected under similar rationales as for claims 3-4 above.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

DRAFTING: DUNG DINH

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (703) 305-9655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:00 AM - 4:30 PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternate Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Lee can be reached at (703) 305-9717.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Box AF
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE")

(703) 308-5359 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).



August 17, 1997
DINH C. DUNG
PATENT EXAMINER
GROUP 2300